DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 948 EC 132 430

AUTHOR Wheeler, Linda; Finley, Mary Jane
TITLE Hearing Resource Program, 1979-1980. Report No. 33:10:79/80:003.
INSTITUTION Phoenix Union High School District, Ariz.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 48p.; Print is variable. Best copy available.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adjustment (to Environment); *Hearing Impairments; High Schools; *Mainstreaming; Program Descriptions; *Resource Room Programs
IDENTIFIERS Arizona (Phoenix)

ABSTRACT

The report describes the Hearing Resource Program at Phoenix (AZ) Union High School District 210, a resource program serving 72 hearing impaired high school students as well as screening incoming freshmen for hearing loss. The program goal was to enable the students to complete their required classes successfully and graduate from high school. Additional goals included developing social skills and increasing receptive and expressive language through lipreading and speech development. Surveys of students, staff, classroom teachers, and parents showed that Ss' study habits and schoolwork improved as a result of the program. Most groups also felt that Ss showed increased self confidence. Recommendations include improving existing facilities. (Author/CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED199948

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PHOENIX UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT # 210

HEARING RESOURCE PROGRAM

1979-1980

REPORT NO. 33:10:79/80:003

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol A. Norris

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RESEARCH SERVICES

Carol Norris, Ph.D.
Director

Linda Wheeler, MA
Evaluation Specialist

Mary Jane Finley, BA
Evaluation Specialist

EC 132430

NOV 3 1980

ABSTRACT

This report presents descriptive information about the Phoenix Union High School District Hearing Resource Program, and an evaluation of program performance during 1979/80.

The program served 72 hearing impaired students during the year, as well as testing incoming freshmen for hearing loss. The majority of students enrolled felt they received sufficient individual assistance, and gave the program an overall rating of excellent or good.

Surveys of students, staff, classroom teachers, and parents showed that student study habits and schoolwork had improved as a result of the program. Most groups also felt that students showed increased self-confidence.

Parents of hearing impaired students felt free to call or visit the Hearing Program when necessary, and rated it as excellent, overall.

ESP chairs and school nurses at each high school were satisfied with the evaluation and placement procedures used by the Hearing Program. Most reported adequate communication with program staff.

Regular classroom teachers were notified when to expect hearing impaired students in their classes, and many had received assistance from the staff in working with these students. However, only 36% had taken the opportunity to visit the Hearing Resource Lab.

All groups surveyed reported that the Hearing Program lacked adequate facilities, particularly large classrooms with adequate soundproofing.

While the program seems to be serving hearing impaired students well, several recommendations for improvements in the areas of IEP completion, program consolidation, and communication between staff, school nurses, and regular classroom teachers are included in this report.

33:10:79/80:003:1m

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction	1
Program Basics	1
Screening Program	2
Program Participants	2
Hearing Impairments	2
Program Withdrawals	5
Individualized Educational Programs	5
Opinion Surveys	
Student Survey	9
Parent Survey	11
Staff Opinion Survey	13
Survey of ESP Chairs and School Nurses	16
Classroom Teacher Opinion Survey	18
Conclusions	20
Recommendations	22
Appendices	
Appendix A - Student Comments	23
Appendix B - Parent Comments	27
Appendix C - Staff Comments	29
Appendix D - ESP Chair Comments	31
Appendix E - Classroom Teacher Comments	33

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Hearing Screening Program	3
2	Age, Sex, and Ethnic Distribution of Students Enrolled	4
3	Classification of Student Hearing Impairments	6
4	Age of Onset of Hearing Impairment	6
5	Previous Services Received by Hearing Program Students	7
6	Additional Services Received by Hearing Impaired Students	7
7	Student Opinion Survey	10
8	Parent Opinion Survey	12
9	Staff Opinion Survey	15
10	Survey of ESP Chairs and School Nurses	17
11	Classroom Teacher Opinion Survey	19

INTRODUCTION

The Hearing Resource Program in the Phoenix Union High School District began in 1966, and was the first public high school program for the hearing impaired in the state of Arizona. The program is designed to serve all hearing impaired students of high school age within the boundaries of the District. During the 1979-80 school year, a total of 72 students from all 11 high schools and several alternative schools were enrolled in the program.

The main goal of the Hearing Program is to enable hearing impaired students to complete their required classes successfully and graduate from high school. Additional goals are:

- to develop student social skills
- to assist students in utilizing residual hearing and/or hearing aids, where possible
- to develop receptive and expressive language skills through:
    - lipreading
    - reading
    - auditory training
    - the development of intelligible speech
    - the development of appropriate oral patterns
    - the development of written language patterns
- maintain good public relations on all campuses

To these ends, the Hearing Program provides the following services:

- Screens all entering ninth graders each year for hearing loss
- Retests all students with suspected hearing loss on initial screening
- Sets up class schedules for hearing impaired students
- Conducts Hearing Lab classes for credit each day
- Gives supportive help to additional students as necessary
- Maintains good public relations with hearing resource teachers from other districts
- Compiles a directory of Hearing Resource Program teachers in the Valley

This report presents an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Hearing Program in meeting its goals, as well as descriptive information about the program itself.

PROGRAM BASICS

The Hearing Program staff consists of five resource teachers and one screening aide. Each of the teachers is assigned to two to four high schools, and travels between those schools daily. Mondays through Thursdays are devoted to Hearing Resource classes and support services, while Fridays are devoted to hearing screening until all freshmen have been examined.

The student/teacher ratio in the Hearing Program is approximately 12:1. A student enrolled in the program full-time spends at least one hour per day in the Hearing Lab. Students who are not full-time Hearing Program students are seen on an assigned schedule. There is no self-contained hearing classroom in the Phoenix Union High School District.

SCREENING PROGRAM

During the 1979-80 school year, 4,643 incoming freshmen at 10 of the 11 regular high schools were tested for hearing impairments. Of these, 360 (7.8%) with possible hearing loss were re-tested. The nurse at Hayden preferred to screen sophomores rather than freshmen, so the Hearing staff member at that school screened 202 sophomores, and re-tested 14. The remaining sophomores were screened by the school nurse. An additional 132 students were screened at Desert Valley High School, and 27 were re-tested.

Initial screening and re-testing lasted through November, 1979. The percentage of incoming freshmen screened (based on 8th week enrollment and excluding Hayden) ranged from 67.3% at Phoenix Union to 93.7% at Camelback, and averaged 84.8%. Cards for students not reached during initial screening were kep in the nurse's office at each school, and those students were tested during the year by either the nurse or the Hearing Program staff. (Table 1 presents initial screening statistics for each school.)

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

The Hearing Program served 72 students during the 1979-80 school year. The average number enrolled at any one time was 63.

Students in the program ranged from 14 to 20 years of age, but the largest number were either 15 or 16 years old. Slightly more than half (57.1%) were female. Representation of various ethnic groups was approximately the same as overall district representation. Table 2 shows student demographic characteristics.

HEARING IMPAIRMENTS

Hearing impaired students are classified as hard of hearing, severely impaired, or profoundly impaired. Those students who are hard of hearing may have normal speech and normal functioning in everyday situations. However, they still have problems in class, as background noises affect their ability to hear their teachers. They may fail to hear parts of sentences or misinterpret words, and be unaware that they have done so. Severely hearing impaired students often need hearing aids, which sometimes assist them to function at the "hard of hearing" level. Their speech may be abnormal, as they are unable to correctly reproduce sounds which they cannot hear. Finally, profoundly impaired students have little or no hearing. As a result, they usually have severe speech problems. Some of them may perform at the "severe" level with hearing aids. General classification of the hearing impairments of Hearing Program students, as based on audiological examination, is shown in Table 3.

33:10:79/80:003lm

Table 1

Hearing Screening Program
Initial Screening*
Regular High Schools

1979-80

School	Number of Freshmen (8th Week)	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Rechecked	Percent Rechecked Out of Number Tested
Alhambra	664	578	87.0%	46	8.0%
Browne	613	544	88.7%	43	7.9%
Camelback	670	628	93.7%	59	9.4%
Central	581	525	90.4%	37	7.0%
East	373	329	88.2%	15	4.6%
Maryvale	785	711	90.6%	62	8.7%
North	296	221	74.7%	11	5.0%
South	549	409	74.5%	31	7.6%
Union	410	276	67.3%	19	6.9%
West	537	422	78.6%	37	8.8%
TOTAL	5,478	4,643	84.8%	360	7.8%

*Note: The school nurse at Carl Hayden High School preferred to screen sophomores. Hearing Program staff members tested 202 sophomores at Hayden, and rechecked 14. The remaining sophomores were screened by the nurse.

33:10:79/80:0031m

Table 2

Hearing Resource Program/District

Age, Sex, and Ethnic Distribution of Students Enrolled

Category		Number	Program Percent	District Percent
Sex:	Male	27	42.9%	50.1%
	Female	36	57.1%	49.9%
	Total	63	100.0%	100.0%
Age:	Under 14	0	0.0%	5.1%
	14	6	9.5%	21.5%
	15	21	33.3%	25.7%
	16	17	27.0%	24.7%
	17	10	15.9%	18.1%
	18	7	11.1%	3.7%
	19	1	1.6%	.7%
	20	1	1.6%	.2%
	Over 20	0	0.0%	.3%
	Total	63	100.0%	100.0%
Ethnic Origin:				
	Native American	2	2.9%	2.5%
	Anglo	47	68.1%	64.3%
	Black	7	10.1%	11.2%
	Hispanic	13	18.9%	21.0%
	Oriental	0	0.0%	1.0%
	Total	69*	100.0%	100.0%

*Ethnic enrollment was calculated at an earlier point in the year, and includes some students who later dropped out of school.

33:10:79/80:0031m

HEARING IMPAIRMENTS - continued

While technical diagnosis is made through an audiological test, additional factors may strongly affect the amount of assistance needed by hearing impaired students. For instance, individuals born with a hearing handicap, because they have no prior experience with speech sounds or speech production, find it more difficult to speak and to lipread than those who could once hear. Consistent parental support and encouragement is also an important factor in student progress, as is the student's general intellectual achievement and understanding of his/her handicap. Finally, the amount and type of previous services received would have an obvious influence on the student's level of function.

As can be seen from Table 4, almost 40% of the students enrolled in the Hearing Program have had hearing impairments since birth or early infancy. Only 18% (11 out of 63) make use of a hearing aid. Also, while many have previously been involved in a Hearing Resource program, some have been in other programs, such as Learning Disabled or Educable Mentally Handicapped, and a few (19.0%) have received no previous services (see Table 5). These factors as well as the audiological exam were considered in placing the hearing impaired students. Therefore, during the 1979-80 school year, 33 students were placed in the Hearing Lab for at least one hour per day, but were "mainstreamed" for all other classes, while 24 received only supportive help from the Hearing staff. No placement information was available for 6 of the students (9.5%). Some Hearing Program students also received services through other programs (see Table 6).

PROGRAM WITHDRAWALS

Nine students withdrew from the Hearing Program during 1979-80. One transferred to another district in Arizona, and one transferred out of state. The remaining seven dropped out of school. The dropout rate for the Hearing Program is therefore approximately 9.7% (7 out of 72), which is lower than the overall District rate. Four of the students who left school had additional handicaps and had been enrolled in other ESP programs concurrently. It can be inferred that school must have been very difficult for those four students and it is not surprising, although unfortunate, that they dropped out.

INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

It is required by federal law (PL94-142) that every exceptional student have an Individualized Educational Program (IEP), and that each IEP contain certain specified elements. As part of the Hearing Program evaluation, student IEPs were examined to determine yearly progress. At that time it

Table 3

Hearing Resource Program

Classification of Student Hearing Impairments

Impairment	Number of Students	Percent
Normal	2*	3 2%
One ear normal, one impaired	11	17.5%
Different degrees of impairment in each ear	4	6.3%
Hard of hearing, both ears	11	17.5%
Severe impairment, both ears	12	19.0%
Profound impairment, both ears	11	17.5%
No information	12	19.0%
TOTAL	63	100.0%

*Students testing as "normal" on an audiological examination after a hearing impairment has been diagnosed are often those with intermittent or fluctuating hearing problems, caused by such factors as severe allergies.

Table 4

Hearing Resource Program

Age of Onset of Hearing Impairment

Age of Onset	Number of Students	Percent
Infancy, Birth	25	39.7%
Before Age 5	4	6.4%
Before Age 10	5	7.9%
After Age 10	4	6.4%
Unknown	4	6.4%
No Information	21	33.3%
TOTAL	63	100.1%**

**Rounding error

Table 5

Hearing Resource Program

Previous Services Received by Hearing Program Students

Type of Service	Number of Students Receiving	Percent
Previous PUHSD Hearing Resource	16	25.4%
Elementary Hearing Resource	8	12.7%
Junior High Hearing Resource	2	3.2%
Residential School for the Deaf	2	3.2%
Gompers Clinic	1	1.6%
Other program (LD, EMH, or Speech)	10	15.9%
None	13	20.6%
No information	11	17.4%
TOTAL	63	100.0%

Table 6

Hearing Resource Program

Additional Services Received by Hearing Impaired Students, 1979-80

Program	Number of Students	Percent
Vision	1	1.6%
Learning Disabled (LD)	8	12.7%
Speech	8	12.7%
Educable Mentally Handicapped (EMH)	6	9.5%
Emotionally Handicapped (EH)	2	3.2%
Speech Referral	1	1.6%
C Level Classes	1	1.6%
None	36	57.1%
TOTAL	63	100.0%

was noticed that many of the IEPs had been only partially completed by Hearing Resource teachers. Some gave no indication as to whether the student was regularly enrolled in the Hearing Resource Lab or was to receive supportive help only when necessary. Services to be received by those who were identified as Hearing Lab students were not specified. Also, while progress towards annual goals was indicated on many IEPs by the last week of classes, 12 (19.0%) had not been updated.* Finally, such factors as age of onset of impairment and previous services received were missing from over half of the IEPs. While not legally required, this information could be of great assistance in the event of staff turnover. Hearing staff members readily cooperated in supplying it when requested.

When IEPs were first required by law, the Hearing Program staff conferred with ESP program representatives from the Phoenix Union High School District and other local districts in an attempt to develop IEP forms and procedures which met federal requirements. In light of information received, they designed the following procedure. General sets of student goals were constructed, those goals were typed onto IEP forms, and the forms were photocopied for use in a number of students' files. At times the same form was used for several years in a row, by simply crossing out old dates and entering new ones. More recent inquiries by the District ESP compliance officer have established that these procedures fall short of compliance with PL94-142, and must be revised. The law requires that each student's IEP be individually constructed and that student goals should be evaluated and updated on at least an annual basis. (To comply with these requirements, the Hearing Resource staff used the new district IEP form for all IEPs written after January, 1980.)

It is recognized that the Hearing Program is small, and that resource teachers are, therefore, individually acquainted with all students. They are well aware of student progress during the year, and keep personal records on all students. However, these progress records have not been adequately transferred to official IEP forms. It is very important to the Phoenix Union High School District that these official forms be in compliance with federal guidelines. To that end, the evaluator has discussed IEP completion with the Hearing Resource staff and program director, and the ESP compliance specialist has furnished the staff with the District's new written guidelines regarding IEP procedures. These guidelines, plus the new District-wide IEP format, should ensure that IEPs for 1980-81 meet federal guidelines.

OPINION SURVEYS

As a measure of program effectiveness, opinions were collected from individuals involved with the Hearing Program. All groups directly concerned (staff, students, and parents of students) were surveyed. In addition, several groups who had contact with the Hearing Program but were not directly involved were surveyed for "outside opinions." These groups included the ESP chairpersons at each campus, high school nurses, and regular classroom teachers who had Hearing Program students in their classes.

*One staff member has indicated that 8 of these IEPs were updated by the end of the school year.

Student Survey

Forty-six (73%) of the students currently enrolled in the Hearing Program answered the survey. The respondents were from 9 of the 11 regular District high schools. Approximately one-fourth were new to the program this year, and the rest had been enrolled for one to three years. (Table 7 shows the results of the student survey.)

The majority of respondents (63%) indicated that the amount of time they spent in the hearing resource room each day was "about right," and over 90% felt they had received enough individual attention from the hearing teacher. These responses suggest that the program staff is evaluating and placing students accurately.

Students reported that the Hearing Program had benefitted them in several ways. Approximately 80% found it easier to do their schoolwork, and stated that both their schoolwork and study habits had improved. They were also able to communicate with their parents about the program and the help they received. Other positive results of the program were an increased involvement in school or social activities (36.9%), greater self-confidence (74%), and help from the Hearing Program staff in making career plans (50%). Hearing staff and regular classroom teachers also cooperated with each other to help their students, according to 82.6% of the respondents.

When asked to give the strong points of the Hearing Program, students mentioned staff assistance in finding classroom teachers who worked well with hearing impaired students. They also found the lipreading classes important.

Few weak points in the program were mentioned, and most referred to the lack of proper space in the hearing resource room and/or the lack of soundproofing from outside noise and vibration.* There were no consistent suggestions for improving the program.

Overall, half the students who responded rated the Hearing Program as excellent, one-third rated it as good, and 15.2% rated it average. None of the students thought the program was poor or very poor (one student did not answer).

*NOTE: Students with partial hearing sometimes find it difficult to distinguish background sounds from those they are attempting to attend to.

Table 7

HEARING RESOURCE PROGRAM

Student Opinion Survey

N = 46

1. I am a student at....

Alhambra	Browne	Camelback	Central	East
8	2	6	1	7
17.4%	4.4%	13.0%	2.2%	15.2%

Haydon	Maryvale	North	South	Union	West
4	9	3	0	6	0
8.7%	19.6%	6.5%		13.0%	

	New	1 Year	2 Years	3 Years	No Answer
2. How long have you been in the high school hearing program?	13	12	9	11	1
	28.3%	26.1%	19.6%	23.9%	2.2%

	About Right	Too Much	Not Enough	No Answer
3. The amount of time I spend in the hearing classroom each day is:	29	6	7	4
	63.0%	13.0%	15.2%	8.7%

	Agree Strongly	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	No Answer
4. I talk with my parents about the program and the help I receive.	14	22	3	6		1
	30.4%	47.8%	6.5%	13.0%		2.2%
5. I receive enough individual attention from the hearing teacher.	23	19	1	3		
	50.0%	41.3%	2.2%	6.5%		
6. The hearing program has helped me to improve in my schoolwork and study habits.	18	18	10			
	39.1%	39.1%	21.7%			
7. The hearing program has made it easier for me to do my work.	20	17	7	1	1	
	43.5%	37.0%	15.2%	2.2%	2.2%	
8. The hearing teacher and my regular teacher cooperate to help me in school.	22	16	6	2		
	47.8%	34.8%	13.0%	4.3%		
9. I have received help from the hearing program staff in planning my future (job, career, etc.) whenever necessary.	12	11	11	9	2	1
	26.1%	23.9%	23.9%	19.6%	4.3%	2.2%
10. I feel more self-confident since being in the hearing program.	13	21	8	3	1	
	28.3%	45.7%	17.4%	6.5%	2.2%	
11. I have become involved in more school or social activities since I have been in the hearing program.	7	10	9	16	4	
	15.2%	21.7%	19.6%	34.8%	8.7%	

	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	No Answer
12. My overall rating of the hearing program is:	23	15	7			1
	50.0%	32.6%	15.2%			2.1%

LW:lm
7/21/80

Parent Survey

Only 19 of the parents, or 30.2%, completed and returned their surveys. Thus, the following discussion is based on a limited number of respondents.

Of those who answered, only three (15.8%) were parents of new students, while most (84.2%) had sons or daughters who had been in the Hearing Program for one to three years. (See Table 8).

Parents who responded to the survey expressed very positive opinions about the program. Over 80% felt that they had adequate contact with Program staff, that they knew what the program was about, and that their children received enough individual attention. All of the parents agreed or agreed strongly with the statement, "I feel free to visit or call the hearing program when necessary."

Parents also felt that their children were progressing well in school as a result of the Hearing Program. Over 90% agreed that the program had helped their children improve their schoolwork, and over 80% felt that work habits had also improved. Parents also saw their children as getting along better with other people and having more self-confidence since being in the Hearing Program (over 70% agreed or agreed strongly with these statements).

Overall, 57.9% of the limited number of parents who responded to this survey rated the Hearing Program as excellent. 36.8% gave it a good rating, and one parent (5.3%) rated it "average." The amount of individual attention available and a "caring" staff were seen as program strong points by parents. Weak points were a lack of equipment and a need for more teachers or aides.

Table 8

HEARING RESOURCE PROGRAM

Parent Opinion Survey

N =19

1. My son/daughter is enrolled at....	Alhambra	Browne	Camelback	Central	East
	5 26.3%	1 5.3%	3 15.8%	1 5.3%	2 10.5%

	Hayden	Maryvale	North	South	Union	West
	1 5.3%	3 15.8%	1 5.3%	1 5.3%	1 5.3%	0

	New	1 year	2 years	3 or more years
2. How long has your child been in the high school hearing program?	3 15.8%	5 26.3%	6 31.6%	5 26.3%

	Agree Strongly	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	No Answer
3. The amount of contact I have with the hearing program staff is adequate.	5 26.3%	11 57.9%	2 10.5%	1 5.3%		
4. My child has discussed the hearing program with me.	7 36.8%	11 57.9%	1 5.3%			
5. The hearing program has helped my child improve his/her schoolwork.	9 47.4%	9 47.4%	1 5.3%			
6. My child has more self-confidence since being in the hearing program.	7 36.8%	7 36.8%	5 26.3%			
7. My child participates in more activities since being in the hearing program.	5 26.3%	6 31.6%	4 21.1%	3 15.8%	1 5.3%	
8. My child gets along better with other people since he/she started the hearing program.	5 26.3%	9 47.4%	5 26.3%			
9. The staff of the hearing program has talked to my child about jobs.	6 31.6%	8 42.1%	3 15.8%	2 10.5%		
10. I know what the hearing program is about.	7 36.8%	10 52.6%	1 5.3%	1 5.3%		
11. My child receives enough individual attention in the hearing program.	11 57.9%	6 31.6%	2 10.5%			
12. There has been an improvement in my child's work habits since he/she has been in the hearing program.	8 42.1%	8 42.1%	2 10.5%	1 5.3%		
13. I feel free to visit or call the hearing program whenever necessary.	9 47.4%	10 52.6%				

	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
14. My overall impression of the program is:	11 57.9%	7 36.8%	1 5.3%		

33:10:79/80:003Im

Staff Opinion Survey

All five of the Hearing Program resource teachers answered this survey. Each of them reported working in two or three of the District high schools, so that each school had at least a part-time Hearing Resource person. (The Hearing Program staff also works with hearing impaired students on special campuses, if necessary.) Staff opinions about the Hearing Program varied according to the schools in which they worked; thus, survey responses are noted as referring to particular schools when applicable. As the number of respondents is small, responses are given by number of individuals only, as percentages might be misleading. Table 9 lists staff responses to the opinion survey.

Two of the members of the Hearing staff felt that they had too many students in the classroom, but two others reported that they had "about the right number" of students. (One staff member did not answer this question.) Staff meetings/ inservice did not encroach on staff teaching time too often, but the amount of paperwork to be completed was a problem, according to four of the five respondents. All five stated that they had had trouble using the IEP in its current format (see page 5 for a discussion of Hearing IEPs). Also, the equipment and facilities at most schools (with the exception of Alhambra, Hayden, and Maryvale) were seen as inadequate. Primarily, these teachers wished that larger classrooms with better acoustical shielding would be specifically assigned to the Hearing Program.

In spite of these drawbacks, Hearing teachers had positive opinions about their program. All of them were satisfied with the initial student screening process, and four out of five approved of the evaluation and placement of students after screening. The fifth staff member commented that she felt students were accurately evaluated and placed, but that the procedure was often excessively delayed by paperwork.

The amount of communication and cooperation with regular classroom teachers who had hearing impaired students in their classrooms was generally reported to be satisfactory, as was the amount of contact with parents. At most of the schools, parents tended to participate in Hearing Program activities, if invited.

School nurses in all schools were seen as helpful, both in the initial screening of students and in the provision of additional help when necessary. Four of five staff members also reported that community agencies provided service or equipment for their students when appropriate.

Hearing staff opinions about student improvements in the program correlated very well with student self-reports. All of the staff members agreed that student work habits and schoolwork had improved, and that students were finding it easier to complete their classwork. Staff members had also seen an increase in student self-confidence. Furthermore, four Hearing teachers reported that their students often showed improved relations with others (one teacher had no opinion). However, while one staff member felt that Hearing Program students seemed to participate in more school or social activities since being in the program, three others had no opinion and one disagreed strongly.

Overall, four of the Hearing Program staff rated their program as "good," and one staff member did not express an opinion. When asked to list program strong points, the Hearing teachers mentioned the good cooperation with the ESP chairs, the one-to-one contact with students, the quality of the staff, and the help hearing impaired students received in choosing classes and teachers.

Weak points of the program were seen as poor facilities on some campuses, an inadequate understanding of the Hearing teacher's work on the part of the regular classroom teachers, and the need for more staff.

As might be expected, possible improvements suggested for the program were better facilities and an additional staff member, as well as a full-time audiologist and "less paperwork and more time to teach."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 9

HEARING PROGRAM

STAFF OPINION SURVEY

N = 5

1. I work at.....

Browne & Maryvale - 1 Camelback, East, & North - 1
South & West - 1 Alhambra & Central - 1
Hayden & Union - 1

2. I have.....students in my special classroom.

Too Many	About the Right Number	Too Few	No Answer
2	2		1

3. Staff meetings/inservice are held....

Too Often	As Often as Necessary	Not Often Enough	No Answer
	4	—	1

	Agree Strongly	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	No Answer
4. The amount of communication I have with my students' regular classroom teachers is adequate.		5		1*		
5. The amount of contact I have with parents of my students is adequate.	1	4		1		
6. The amount of paperwork I have to do is about right.			1	1	3	
7. The hearing program's equipment and facilities are adequate.	1	3		3	2	
8. I am satisfied with the screening process for this program.	4	1				
9. Evaluation and placement of handicapped students after screening is satisfactory.		4				
10. Regular classroom teachers who have handicapped students in their classes are generally good about cooperating with the hearing program.		5		1		
11. If invited, parents tend to participate in the hearing program.		4		1	1	
12. After they are involved in the hearing program, students often show improved relationships with others.		4				1
13. My students' work habits have improved since they joined the program.		5				
14. The hearing program has helped the students improve their schoolwork.	1	4				
15. The hearing program helps the students complete their work more easily.	1	4				
16. After being in the hearing program, students seem to participate in more school or social activities.		1	3		1	
17. Student self-confidence improves while in the hearing program.		5				
18. I have trouble using the IEP in its present format.	1	3		1		
19. The school nurse cooperates in hearing screening or aids handicapped students whenever necessary.	3	2	-			
20. Community agencies are helpful in providing services or equipment for students when needed.		4	1			

21. My overall rating of the program for hearing handicapped students is:	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	No Answer
		4				1

*Note that totals may sum to more than 5, as staff members sometimes marked answers for each of the schools at which they worked.

33:10:79/80:0031m

Survey of ESP Chairs and School Nurses

Nine ESP chairs and nine school nurses responded to the survey. (See Table 10.) Their opinions of the Hearing Program were generally very favorable. Over 75% of each group were satisfied with the referral process for the Hearing Program, with only two ESP chairs and two nurses indicating degrees of dissatisfaction. All of the ESP chairs, and 66.7% of the nurses, felt that evaluation and placement of handicapped students after referral was satisfactory. (22.2% of the nurses had no opinion on this question, and 11.1% disagreed.) Almost all respondents stated that regular classroom teachers cooperate with the Hearing Program staff to serve handicapped students. Good communication between regular classroom teachers and the ESP chairs and school nurses was also reported.

Both ESP chairs and nurses perceived the Hearing Resource staff as having a strong interest in their students. Only one person, a nurse, disagreed with this statement. All of the ESP chairs felt they received adequate communication from program staff, but three of the nurses did not.

Overall opinions of the Hearing Resource Program ranged from average to excellent, with a majority of both groups (66.7% of ESP chairs, 55.6% of nurses) rating it as excellent. The strong points of the program were seen as an excellent, concerned staff, a good screening program, and good follow-through. Program weak points mentioned referred not to the program itself; but to a lack of facilities and equipment, and the amount of travel required of staff.

Table 10

HEARING PROGRAM

Survey of ESP Chairs and School Nurses

(N = 9 ESP chairs, 9 nurses)

1. I work at....

Alhambra	Browne	Camelback	Central	East	Hayden
2 11.1%	2 11.1%	1 5.6%	2 11.1%	2 11.1%	2 11.1%

Maryvale	North	South	Union	West
2 11.1%	1 5.6%	2 11.1%	0	2 11.1%

2. I am a(n)....

ESP Chair	School Nurse
9 50.0%	9 50.0%

		Agree Strongly	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	No Answer
3. I am satisfied with the referral process for the hearing program.	Chairs:	3 33.3%	4 44.4%		1 11.1%	1 11.1%	
	Nurses:	4 44.4%	3 33.3%		2 22.2%		
4. Evaluation and placement of handicapped students after referral is satisfactory.	Chairs:	4 44.4%	5 55.6%				
	Nurses:	3 33.3%	3 33.3%	2 22.2%	1 11.1%		
5. Regular classroom teachers who have handicapped students in their classes are generally good about cooperating with the hearing program.	Chairs:	3 33.3%	5 55.5%	1 11.1%			
	Nurses:	2 22.2%	7 77.8%				
6. Community agencies are helpful in providing services or equipment for students.	Chairs:	1 11.1%	4 44.4%	4 44.4%			
	Nurses:	1 11.1%	3 33.3%	3 33.3%	1 11.1%		1 11.1%
7. The amount of communication I have with regular classroom teachers who have handicapped students in their classes is adequate.	Chairs:	1 11.1%	6 66.7%	2 22.2%			
	Nurses:	2 22.2%	5 55.6%		2 22.2%		
8. The amount of communication I have with the hearing program staff is adequate.	Chairs:	5 55.6%	4 44.4%				
	Nurses:	5 55.6%	1 11.1%		3 33.3%		
9. The hearing program staff shows a strong interest in their students.	Chairs:	7 77.8%	2 22.2%				
	Nurses:	5 55.6%	2 22.2%	1 11.1%		1 11.1%	

		Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	No Answer
10. My overall rating of the program for hearing handicapped students is:	Chairs:	6 66.7%	3 33.3%				
	Nurses:	5 55.6%	3 33.3%	1 11.1%			

33:10:79/80:0031m

Classroom Teacher Opinion Survey

Over half of the teachers who received surveys completed and returned them, for a total of 86 respondents. All regular District high schools and one alternative school were represented. The majority of those who responded (61.6%) had one hearing impaired student in the classroom, but some had as many as five.

In general, teachers felt that the Hearing Resource Program had helped their students. Almost 80% stated that hearing impaired students were making satisfactory progress in their regular classes. Over half (51.2%) of the teachers reported that the hearing program helped students understand their classwork and keep up with their classmates more easily. However, the percentage of "no opinion" or "no answer" responses on these questions was high: 44.2% of the teachers declined to give an opinion.* Table 11 shows teacher responses to the survey.

The majority of respondents also had no opinion about whether the Hearing Program gives the students more confidence or whether "mainstreaming" hearing impaired students makes other students feel more at ease with handicapped people. Teachers did state, however, that they felt comfortable with the hearing impaired students in their classes (83.7% "agreed" or "agreed strongly" with this statement). Many of them (44.2%) agreed that without the Hearing Program it would have been necessary to devote more individual attention to handicapped students during regular class time.

Approximately 70% of the teachers who responded felt that they received adequate communication from the Hearing Program staff. They also reported that the staff notified them when to expect a hearing impaired student. Almost half (45.4%) stated that the hearing teacher had assisted them in working with hearing impaired students, but 24.4% felt they had not received such assistance. (30% of the teachers failed to answer or had no opinion on this question.)

When asked to give an overall rating of the Hearing Resource Program, most classroom teachers indicated that it was "good" (38.4%) or "excellent" (24.4%). One teacher (1.2%) rated it as "poor," 14.0% saw the program as "average" and 22.1% declined to answer. The program staff itself was seen as a major program strength, while lack of communication with classroom teachers and lack of adequate facilities were mentioned as program weaknesses. (Note that only 36% of these teachers indicated that they had visited the hearing resource area.)

*Care should be taken in interpretation of the results of questions which were answered by a relatively small number of respondents.

Table 11

HEARING RESOURCE PROGRAM

Classroom Teacher Opinion Survey

N = 86

1. I teach at....	Alhambra	Browne	Camelback	Central	East	Hayden	
	15 17.4%	7 8.1%	10 17.6%	8 9.3%	12 14.0%	7 8.1%	
	Maryvale	North	South	Union	West	BACE	No Answer
	14 16.3%	6 7.0%	0	4 4.7%	1 1.2%	1 1.2%	1 1.2%
2. My subject area is....	English	Science	Math	Social Studies	ESP		
	20 23.3%	6 7.0%	10 11.6%	7 8.1%	12 14.0%		
	P.E.	Elective	No Answer				
	5 5.8%	23 26.7%	3 3.5%				
	0	1	2	3	4	5	No Answer
3. Number of hearing handicapped students in my class:	4 4.7%	53 61.6%	15 17.4%	5 5.8%	2 2.3%	1 1.2%	6 7.0%
	Agree Strongly	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	No Answer	
4. The amount of communication I have with the hearing teacher is adequate.	21 24.4%	40 46.5%	8 9.3%	7 8.1%	3 3.5%	7 8.1%	
5. The hearing class aids the students in understanding regular classroom work.	17 19.8%	27 31.4%	33 38.4%	4 4.7%		5 5.8%	
6. Students in the hearing program are making satisfactory progress in my class.	21 24.4%	47 54.7%	4 4.7%	9 10.5%		5 5.8%	
7. The hearing program has helped the students involved keep up with the regular classroom work.	18 20.9%	26 30.2%	30 34.9%	4 4.7%		8 9.3%	
8. The hearing program seems to give the students more self-confidence.	15 17.4%	23 26.7%	41 47.7%	1 1.2%		6 7.0%	
9. The hearing resource teacher has assisted me in developing workable classroom strategies for the hearing impaired student.	12 14.0%	27 31.4%	18 20.9%	15 17.4%	6 7.0%	8 9.3%	
10. Having the hearing handicapped students in the class made the other students feel more at ease with handicapped people.	3 3.5%	15 17.4%	56 65.1%	4 4.7%	1 1.2%	7 8.1%	
11. Without the hearing program, it would be necessary to devote a lot more individual attention to handicapped students during regular class time.	11 12.8%	27 31.4%	24 27.9%	15 17.4%	1 1.2%	8 9.3%	
12. I have visited the hearing resource area.	15 17.4%	16 18.6%	13 15.1%	21 24.4%	7 8.1%	14 16.3%	
13. The hearing resource teacher informs me when to expect a hearing impaired student in my class.	32 37.2%	33 38.4%	4 4.7%	5 5.8%	1 1.2%	11 12.8%	
14. I fill out and return the progress reports the hearing program sends me.	20 23.3%	41 47.7%	10 11.6%	2 2.3%	1 1.2%	12 14.0%	
15. I feel comfortable with the hearing handicapped student(s) in my class.	29 33.7%	43 50.0%	4 4.7%	1 1.2%		9 10.5%	
	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	No Answer	
16. My overall impression of the hearing program is:	21 24.4%	33 38.4%	12 14.0%	1 1.2%		19 22.1%	

CONCLUSIONS

1. By December, 1979, the Hearing Program staff had screened 84.8% of the freshmen at 10 of the 11 regular District high schools. The remainder were screened later in the year, as the opportunity arose. Freshmen at Hayden were not tested, as the nurse preferred to screen sophomores.

2. During 1979-80, a total of 72 hearing handicapped students were served by the Hearing Resource Program. An average of 63 students were enrolled at any one time.

3. The Hearing Program dropout rate was lower than the overall District rate. Students who dropped out tended to have multiple handicaps.

4. Information obtained by the District ESP compliance specialist indicates that the Hearing Program practice of duplicating Individualized Education Programs for use in students' files does not meet federal requirements, although the staff had been informed in the past that such a practice was permissable. Also, hearing handicapped student IEPs did not always contain a list of the specific services provided, or notations of progress towards annual goals.

5. Students enrolled in the Hearing Program felt that they received sufficient individual assistance from their resource teachers. They also reported that their hearing teachers and regular classroom teachers cooperated to help them succeed academically. Half of the students gave the Hearing Program an overall rating of excellent, and another 30% rated it as good.

6. Students, Hearing Program staff, classroom teachers, and parents all stated that student study habits and schoolwork had improved since being in the program. Students, staff, and parents also agreed that students had gained self-confidence.

7. Parents of hearing impaired students felt free to call or visit the program when necessary. They were very positive about the program, and a majority gave it an overall rating of excellent.

8. Hearing Program staff were satisfied with initial student screening, evaluation, and placement. At most schools, staff members reported good communication with regular classroom teachers, school nurses, and ESP chairs.

9. ESP chairs felt that the evaluation and placement of hearing handicapped students was satisfactory. They reported good communication with Hearing Program staff, and saw the staff as being strongly interested in their students' welfare. The majority of ESP chairs rated the program as excellent.

10. School nurses also thought hearing evaluation and placement procedures were satisfactory and that the Hearing Program staff showed a strong interest in their students. One-third expressed a need for better communication with the staff. The majority of nurses gave the Hearing Program an overall rating of excellent.

11. The majority of classroom teachers surveyed reported that they were notified by the Hearing Program staff when a hearing impaired student was enrolling in their classes. Almost half of the teachers had received assistance from the staff in working with hearing impaired students. However, only 36% had ever taken the opportunity to visit the Hearing Resource Lab. The largest percentage of respondents (38.4%) felt that the Hearing Program was "good", and another 24.4% saw it as "excellent".

12. Strong points of the Hearing Program, according to survey respondents, included a concerned, involved staff, the amount of individual assistance available, the help students received in choosing regular classroom teachers, and the screening procedures.

13. The major weak point of the program, mentioned by all groups surveyed, was a lack of adequate facilities on many campuses. Other weak points were a need for more staff (an audiologist, additional teachers, more aides), and the amount of travel required of staff members.

14. The number of classroom teachers declining to answer specific questions on the classroom teacher survey was sometimes quite high. The percentage of "no answer" or "no opinion" responses on individual items ranged from 10.5% to 73.2%.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Hearing Program staff members should carefully adhere to the steps set out in the new "Procedure to Refer, Evaluate, and Place a Student in an Exceptional Student Program", and be certain that the required information is present on all student IEPs.

2. The District should investigate the possibility of consolidating the Hearing Program onto fewer campuses. The expense of transporting students to more distant schools might be more than offset by reduced expenses for teacher travel. Resource teachers would then be able to spend more time teaching and less time traveling between campuses. Equipment could be consolidated into fewer, better equipped classrooms; which could be exclusively assigned to the Hearing Program. Hearing impaired students would be able to receive additional assistance more often, if necessary. (While parents often prefer that their children attend neighborhood schools, ESP staff and budgetary considerations may become an overriding factor.)

3. If it is not possible to consolidate the Hearing Program onto fewer campuses, an attempt should be made to improve existing facilities. Specifically, there should be a classroom on each campus reserved only for the Hearing Resource Lab, and all Hearing Labs should be soundproofed.

4. The school nurse at Carl Hayden High School should standardize the hearing screening program at that school with those in the other 10 high schools. Under the current procedures, it is possible that Carl Hayden students transferring to another school after the freshman year might never be tested for hearing loss.

5. The Hearing staff should continue their successful practice of notifying teachers when to expect hearing impaired students, and of "matching" students with interested classroom teachers.

6. Classroom teachers should take the initiative to visit the Hearing Resource Lab when they first have hearing impaired students in their classes, in order to become familiar with both the program and the staff.

7. Hearing Program staff members should initiate discussion of communication problems as identified by school nurses on an informal, individual basis.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Appendix A

HEARING PROGRAM

STUDENT OPINION SURVEY

Question #13: I THINK THE PROGRAM'S STRONG POINTS ARE:

- Teacher always tries to help you.
- Having occassionally a magazine to read a play.
- Teachers helping me in my schoolwork.
- I think that they really do a good job in trying to help you and I have improved.
- I learn sign language.
- Helping the students cope with crisis in their life facing these problems.
- Help when I need it.
- Privacy, a private teacher helps you when ever you needed it.
- The teachers can find out how we're doing in the class.
- I don't like it, but it's O.K. I do need help.
- _____ help me to understand. _____ explain to teacher what I did wrong.
- Help me when I needed it.
- Being able to get my work done.
- When we do sentences together.
- Being able to do your work.
- It gives the student a chance to talk about his problems in or out of the classroom.
- I haven't been involved in the program enough to know but from what I have seen it has all strong points.
- I get help with speech and hearing.
- I like reading.
- The resources, books, and papers.
- Checking up on our grades.
- Help with reading.
- Help with outside problems. It's helping me get the placement I need.
- Chooses the right teacher new vocabulary, meet new friends, help, talk about college plans.
- I can come in for help any time. Get help with personnel problems. They were understanding. Career goal help.
- New vocabulary, lip read, finger spell, sign language, drivers manuals questions, meet some hearing loss kids.
- Choosing the right teacher, classes, activity. Help me meet new people, helps me to get work on time. Helps me sell girl scout cookies and more independent, like riding buses to school.

HEARING PROGRAM

STUDENT OPINION SURVEY

Question #13 (cont.): I THINK THE PROGRAM"S STRONG POINTS ARE:

- Homework done, pick teachers for me. Get into ROTC, make new friends.
- Helps choose the right classroom teachers. Getting the work done on time.
- Choose the right teachers, classes, and activities. Help me get the assistant in the library. Help teacher cooperate with me better and get along with the students. Getting my high school work done on time. Help student get along and know there are deaf students on campus. Got acquainted with better friends and help me in understanding hearing loss charts and what it is like to be deaf. Also, help me have more responsibility of myself and better speech and communication. Helps me understand about other things that I've never knew of before. It also gives me better grades in my classes and brings me high vocabulary and grade levels. Gave me more understanding in having to be around other hearing people and how to cooperate with them and getting along in jobs and around people, activities in this world. It also help me get a job during my summer in CETA program too. I will also have another this summer in the library because of the help in this hearing program.
- Lip read, contact with more people.
- Classroom work done, and explain the vocabulary. I get books from library. Necessary phone calls. Help plan career.
- Individual attention, tutoring.
- The help we get and the cooperation from some of the teachers.
- Teacher cooperation and encouragement.
- Hearing lab.
- Helps me in my studies. I'm understanding more.
- It helps me get my work done and understand my work more fully.
- It helps me get through school and learn something while at the same time teaches me how to get along with my hearing in social life.
- Lip reading, homework study, current events.

33:10:79/80:0031m

HEARING PROGRAM

STUDENT OPINION SURVEY

Question #14: I THINK THE PROGRAM''S WEAK POINTS ARE:

- The room is a bit too small.
- Needs a bigger class.
- Whenever schedules are so messed up that teachers can't help being late.
- Not enough time.
- No weak points a good program to help people out.
- Too much paperwork.
- When the boys come in late. I don't really like the class.
- Too many restrictions.
- We don't see each other often.
- Uncomfortable to work in our room. I need a better table because of my wheelchair.
- We need our own soundproof room. Where nobody can bug us.
- It was not the best program it was still hard to hear.
- Too crowded.
- We need our own room. There's too many in a class and just one teacher. I think there needs to be a teacher's aide.
- Not enough sign language.
- It's crowded; too many people.
- Not worth mentioning.
- Lip reading too often, too much time spent there.
- We have a very poor room.

HEARING PROGRAM

STUDENT OPINION SURVEY

Question #15: WAYS TO IMPROVE THE PROGRAM:

- New room, more people you have to do too much work on Wednesday.
- Have none except maybe shorter hours and a permanent room without all the hassle of moving around and teachers bugging you when doing nothing wrong or bad.
- There are really no ways to improve it but, they got to understand that I live across the 2 bridges and the situation I'm in now I have trouble getting to school and they should excuse all people for that matter!
- Have more sign language.
- Give us a soundproof room.
- Get our own rooms, no hassles.
- Do more sign language in the class.
- Make it better.
- Try to be here after and work harder.
- I like _____ to stay all day just in case I need her help.
- Eliminate all unnecessary paperwork.
- To get me out of the class.
- Not to have so much paperwork.
- Plan to go on field trips. Do more activities (outside classroom).
- Increase days spent with student.
- Keep it the same way that it is.
- Have more teachers.
- To let us spend more time in the class.

APPENDIX B

Appendix B

HEARING PROGRAM

PARENT OPINION SURVEY

Question #15: I THINK THE PROGRAM'S STRONG POINTS ARE:

- Individual attention to each child.
- Teacher and student contact.
- Gives students a much needed helping hand to become self-sufficient persons.
- Individual attention--good for remediation due to lack of hearing in a regular classroom. But it needs a wider scope--program could have limitless possibilities.
- The teacher in this class is doing her very best, with the short time she has with the students.
- The fact that my child respects her hearing program teacher so much and she has been of much help in an emotional aspect.
- Inidividual help and contact with teachers--improved learning habits (first year).
- The individual attention that's given my son and the help received with his homework.
- Good resource teacher, knowledgeable about the needs of the hearing impaired, takes a lot of pressure off me, helping my child get a high school education.
- Giving my daughter a chance to be who she is.
- Individual attention.
- Individual help.
- The extra help and encouragement and caring about my child would be first.
- Helping my child to understand (and hear) his homework assignments.
- The individual help the student gets.

Question #16: I THINK THE PROGRAM'S WEAK POINTS ARE:

- They could possibly hire more teachers for the hearing impaired.
- Teacher doesn't have enough time on campus.
- English.
- Keeping students' interest so they don't want to drop the class.
- The teacher needs a teachers aide to help in each class.
- No stability--kids need a hearing lab, with equipment, visual aids, mouth media guides, helps with learning--kids need to learn alternative communication, lip reading, sign language, etc. and not in a moveable classroom.
- That some teachers don't cooperate with the hearing instructor.

HEARING PROGRAM

PARENT OPINION SURVEY

Question #17: POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE PROGRAM:

- Mostly for parents to cooperate better with the hearing instructor.
- More opportunity to examine all possible goals for hearing impaired with regard to future career plans, equipment availability for private use. Field trips e.g. phone company, visit would be a good trip--T.V. studio--anyone having to do with sound or amplification. Sports, music--where the hearing handicapped individual can fit in. If we are teaching this child to function in a normal school system, we are, in essence telling him he is able also to function in a normal world after high school.
- Needs a classroom (soundproof).

APPENDIX C

Appendix C

Hearing Program - Staff Opinion Survey

Comments - 5 responses

7. The hearing program's equipment and facilities are adequate. If not, what is needed?

- Larger room at Phoenix Union.
- A room large enough.
- At Trevor Browne, a place to securely keep materials, better lighting, and less noise.
- At Central, there is not a room specifically assigned for Hearing Lab.

22. I think the program's strong points are:

- Cooperation of ESP program, quality staff, good interpersonal relationships with students and hearing resource teachers.
- Very good screening program - good staff but not enough of them - as a team we seem to work well together - we are very fortunate having an audiologist working with us.
- Teacher's one to one contact with student. Cooperation between ESP department and H.H. teacher - good staff.
- Help students choose classes and teachers, cooperation with ESP chairs, H. Resource staff work well together.
- The dedication of the teachers.

23. I think the program's weak points are:

- Poor facilities in some schools, lack of time on each campus to do adequate job - poor teacher-teacher contact.
- Poor facilities on some campuses. General education teachers do not always understand the job of the hearing resource teacher.
- Too few staff for number of students. General education teachers do not have good idea of the job of the hearing resource teacher, not enough teacher-teacher contact - not enough time on each campus.
- Need more staff and an open ended resource room where students can receive credit for English, Free Enterprise, and Government - Title one class is now closed to them.
- Poor facilities in some schools (P.U.), lack of staff, lack of parent and teacher cooperation at P.U.

24. Possible improvements in the program:

- Better facilities, more staff members. A fully staffed Resource Room on one campus.
- One additional staff member. Full time audiologist with equipment.
- More staff needed.
- Less paper work and more time to teach - if we cannot have an open ended room as mentioned above, then the right to give English credit through hearing lab is necessary in some cases.
- 1 more staff member, proper audiological equipment and facilities, improved communication with administrators.

LW:gg
4-15-80

APPENDIX D

Appendix D

HEARING PROGRAM

ESP CHAIR SURVEY

Question #11: THE PROGRAM'S STRONG POINTS ARE:

- Excellent and well prepared staff.
- a. Process of screening incoming freshmen. b. Opportunity for individual student attention. c. Success rate satisfactory. d. Teachers are supportive in working with students.
- Good feed-back from director. No long waiting for results.
- a. Excellent rapport between itinerant and ESP staff and students. b. Excellent program.
- Excellent, well-trained, dedicated staff. Very much concerned with each student.
- Interest, concern, continuity and good rapport.
- Close student contact. Regular scheduled hearing lab.

Question #12: THE PROGRAM'S WEAK POINTS ARE:

- Time lost in teacher trouble that could be applied to individual student support.
- Staff is spread too thinly; not enough time is allotted per school; staffing ratios too high. It's imperative for morale, for faculty and ESP staff communication, integration and in-service and for parent/teacher communication that a hearing resource teacher be shared maximumly between two facilities. Anything less than this is unrealistic and does not provide for true service.
- Inadequate facilities.
- a. Need for acoustical treatment in rooms. b. Need for additional staff to some campuses.
- a. Records from elementary schools are often incomplete. b. Screening process only occurs on Fridays and mass screening of students at West for hearing problems happens half-way into the semester. Compliance for students placed in ESP occurs late in August. c. Contact time with campus staff is limited as assigned staff is on a split assignment. d. As staff is here Monday - Thursday, and students are enrolled Monday - Friday for credit, locating placement for Friday has posed a problem. Solution has been support taking from class rather than full enrollment.
- Need to be on campus every day.

HEARING PROGRAM

SCHOOL NURSES SURVEY

Question #11: THE PROGRAM'S STRONG POINTS ARE:

- The interest and knowledge cooperation of the staff (hearing).
- Staff interest and help for students.
- Excellent follow through by hearing program staff.
- Screening program--good communication with resource teachers.
- Excellent screening--good resource teachers and program.
- The handicapped students are tested immediately and placed in the hearing lab.

Question #12: THE PROGRAM'S WEAK POINTS ARE:

- I think it is run well, it's the referrals that are frustrating, getting parents to respond is difficult.
- Lack of resource teachers and limited time to spend with students--too much time between screening and referral of students and time of placement.
- Improve communications on evaluation; placement; and progress of students referred to the program.
- Lack of time for complete follow-up.
- The knowledge the teachers have concerning hearing.

APPENDIX E

Appendix E

HEARING PROGRAM

CLASSROOM TEACHER OPINION SURVEY

Question #17: PROGRAM STRENGTHS:

- The biggest advantage is the extra help given the hearing impaired students academically and mentally (self-concept).
- _____ is excellent. She works closely with me, tells me where to seat the students and I try to enunciate carefully when these students are in class so they can read my lips.
- I have been informed by a note that I have a hearing handicapped student.
- Very capable specialists.
- Teacher has the advantage of working one to one with students.
- Mainstreaming.
- The one to one basis.
- Regular communication with teachers.
- The students seem to feel very confident with their hearing teacher.
- Student involvement in regular classroom activities. Individual attention in lab.
- The resource teacher is congenial and helpful when help is needed. She is very interested in her students.
- We have an excellent program at Alhambra and a very dedicated, sensitive teacher.
- Concern for students shown by resource teacher along with cooperation.
- Communication from hearing resource teacher helps to recognize strengths and weaknesses.
- AHS "hearing" teacher.
- Very competent teacher here at Alhambra. Friendly, and important to our school.
- It is a good program. Special students need as much individual help as time will permit.
- Good communication and positive reinforcement of students.
- _____ works very closely with me and the kids.
- My contact has been with the students rather than the center or program.
- I do not feel qualified to answer this. I am grateful for info on students with handicaps at beginning of time I work with them. I have received this info.
- The teacher is easy to work with.
- The resource teacher has kept me well informed on pupils with hearing loss.
- Actual rapport and communication with the hearing resource teacher.

HEARING PROGRAM

CLASSROOM TEACHER OPINION SURVEY

Question #17 (cont.): PROGRAM STRENGTHS:

- _____ was a guest speaker in my Child Development class. Excellent presentation, very well received by the students.
- The fact we have a program.
- _____ seems genuinely concerned in helping the hearing impaired. She has spoken to my Child Development classes on the subject of the hearing impaired student. She did an excellent job.
- Satisfactory.
- Teacher-student rapport good--teacher and hearing resource teacher communication has been good.
- Well-informed instructor--excellent knowledge--liked by students.
- Gives students confidence and makes them want to come to class.

HEARING PROGRAM

CLASSROOM TEACHER OPINION SURVEY

Question #18: PROGRAM WEAKNESSES:

- Students don't necessarily get satisfactory grades, as a result. Nor do they demonstrate improvement in many cases.
- Facilities are poor--room is small and must be shared by others.
- Didn't know I had a hearing handicapped student until about one week ago.
- Teacher contact.
- Resource teacher comes at inconvenient times.
- No communication.
- Larger facility needed.
- Perhaps a little more communication.
- Needs contact or progress reports more often.
- I do not get assistance with class work because student sews in class and has no homework.
- Not enough feedback with class work and hearing program.
- Better facilities.
- Maybe just the small area they have to work in.
- Cannot monitor student continuously while in other classrooms.
- Students often use the program for a "crutch" to escape if they need it-- (I realize this is a problem of the kids; not the program).
- Teacher not on campus enough.
- Students are out of class.
- _____ must divide her time between two schools. Conflicts in schedules often make it difficult for her to be at Browne.
- Needs to spend more time with students.
- I did not know we had a hearing resource teacher. I have been given no guidance, information, or instruction as to any help the student needs nor seating preference etc.
- In some cases too many students will have a negative effect on overall operation or effectiveness.

HEARING PROGRAM

CLASSROOM TEACHER OPINION SURVEY

Question #19: POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS:

- More cooperation from "regular" classroom teachers instead of just verbal approval.
- Even greater contact with classroom instructor.
- Smaller case load which I realize is very idealistic comment.
- More time for teacher to be at Browne.
- Send the teacher to the class.
- Full-time hearing teacher on our campus.
- More complete information provided about students to teachers from hearing program staff.
- Inform the teachers as to what the hearing program actually does for the students. I do not mean this critically, but I do not know what is done other than letting us know the kids have a hearing problem. Do you teach them hearing skills, etc.
- Provide more help for classroom teacher incorporate style that better enable students to program.
- A new classroom situation.
- Perhaps a meeting with all 3 people at one time (special teacher, classroom teacher and student) to see if all are understanding each others problems might be useful.
- Improved facilities.
- Might give more time on campus.
- 1. I'm not totally aware of the program's responsibilities. I would like to know what the program is doing for these students. 2. Students sometimes have behavior problems, etc. that might be solved with the cooperation of the hearing teacher.
- More info! I know practically nothing of the program.
- I have not had enough hearing loss students in class that created any problem so as to make a valid recommendation.
- Resource teacher should visit at most convenient time for classroom teacher.
- Education of teacher on how to help student.
- Meet with teachers so we have info on where to place student in room, amount of hearing loss, etc.
- Improve facilities--should have bigger facilities--some opportunity should be given to make staff aware of "what is available."
- Just make the tacher aware of the student's needs and leave it to the individual teacher.

HEARING PROGRAM

CLASSROOM TEACHER OPINION SURVEY

COMMENTS:

- I have one student in program and after he is aware that you are talking to him there is no difference between him and other students. One could draw the conclusion that the program is successful or without knowing what help the program has provided him one might erroneously conclude that the program is unsuccessful.
- It is not possible for me to answer these questions without talking to the hearing resource teacher. Most of these questions are "yes and no" questions about "specifics."
- I've only had (to my knowledge) one student each semester who has hearing problems. It is not to the extent to even be noticed by the teacher or other students. Therefore, I cannot adequately evaluate the program.
- I had this student in Beginning Typing. In this course, the first semester is very basic with few subtleties until the last few weeks. This is when the student started to lose ground. Whether the hearing teacher helped or was able to help. I don't know. Had I been able to communicate better she would have achieved a great deal more.
- This is very difficult to complete because the student I have is a Library student assistant who works very well and we have no problems except when his hearing aid is not working. He serves the patrons well; most of them do not realize he has a hearing problem.
- I know virtually nothing about the program, have only the slightest contact with personnel and do not feel qualified to make judgments re: same.
- To the best of my knowledge I have never had any contact with the resource hearing teacher. I know nothing about the program, so I cannot give you much of an evaluation.
- I also feel that the responses above do not fit the questions. Answers such as yes - no - always - sometimes, etc. would fit the questions better.
- I am afraid that my opinions may not be worth much in this matter; other than being notified that a student of mine was enrolled in this program, I really haven't had enough contact with the program to effectively evaluate it.
- I am a reading resource teacher and have no regular class where the student receives a grade. For this reason, I have very little contact with the hearing specialist. I have spoken with the hearing specialist concerning my son who has a hearing loss and she was extremely helpful and informative.
- The student I have apparently does not need the program. He is doing fine in my class without any special help from me.